



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,363	08/04/2003	Cedric Airaud	550-456	5129

23117 7590 03/10/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

PUENTE, EMERSON C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/633,363	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AIRAUD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Emerson C. Puente	<b>Art Unit</b> 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/9/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is made **Non-Final**. Claims 1-44 have been examined.

#### ***Drawings***

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the drawings are informal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification does not include a "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION". Please insert the heading on page 12 of disclosure.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 4, 23, 25, and 28 objected to because of the following informalities:

In regards to claim 1, please change "outer input port" to "router input port" (see line 6 of claim).

In regards to claim 1, please delete "25" (see line 22 of claim).

Art Unit: 2113

In regards to claim 4, please delete “10” (see line 3 of claim).

In regards to claim 23, please change “m6dule” to “module” (see line 2 of claim).

In regards to claim 25, please delete “20” (see line 16 of claim).

In regards to claim 25, please remove indentation (see line 18 of claim).

In regards to claim 28, please change “syncbronising” to “synchronising” (see line 2 of claim).

In regards to claim 28, please change “andr” to “and” (see line 2 of claim).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In regards to claim 1, applicant discloses “a second mapping module .....to supply said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated device ...” However, specification discloses the second cross triggering interface module (second mapping module) forwarding the information

Art Unit: 2113

to a second processor core (another associated device), not the first processor core (said associated device) (see top of page 15 of specifications).

In regards to claim 25, applicant discloses “supplying said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated processing device ....”. However, specification discloses the second cross triggering interface module (second mapping operation) forwarding the information to a second processor core (another associated device), not the first processor core (said associated device) (see top of page 15 of specifications).

The remaining claims, not specifically mentioned, are rejected because they are dependent upon one of the claims mentioned above.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “said first mapped diagnostic event signal” in line 16 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner is uncertain whether “said first mapped diagnostic event signal” is in reference to the “diagnostic event signal” or a different signal.

Furthermore, claim 1 discloses “a second mapping module .....to supply said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated device ...” However, specification discloses the second cross triggering interface module (second mapping module) forwarding the information to a second processor core (another associated device), not the first processor core (said associated

Art Unit: 2113

device) (see top of page 15 of specifications). Examiner is uncertain whether applicant meant the second mapping module to supply said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated device or another processing device.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said combining logic" in line 1 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner suggests changing the dependency from claim 1 to claim 2, as claim 2 discloses a combining logic.

Claim 25 discloses "supplying said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated processing device ....". However, specification discloses the second cross triggering interface module (second mapping operation) forwarding the information to a second processor core (another associated device), not the first processor core (said associated device) (see top of page 15 of specifications). Examiner is uncertain whether applicant meant the second mapping operation to supply said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated device or another processing device.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "said combining step" in line 1 of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner suggests changing the dependency from claim 25 to claim 26, as claim 26 discloses a combining step.

The remaining claims, not specifically mentioned, are rejected because they are dependent upon one of the claims mentioned above.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See PTO 892.

Art Unit: 2113


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ecp

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
JURY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100